

Remarks

Applicants request a reconsideration of the present patent application in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-10, 12-23, and 25-70 are in the application.

Claims 3, 51-52, 54, 56-58, and 63-64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1). Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 10, 12-15, 25-34, 44-45, 47-48, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662). Claims 65-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Vaithyanathan (U.S. Patent 5,857,179). Claims 5 and 41-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1). Claims 61-62 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Walker (U.S. Patent 6,449,616 B1). Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kovak (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1). Claims 11, 19, 21-23, and 49-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S.

Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1). Claims 55 and 59-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claims 51 and 54 above, and further in view of Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1). Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Riley (U.S. Patent 1,090,346). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Publication 2001/0047373 A1). Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,301,574 B1). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162). Claims 35 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) and Kovak (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) as applied to claims 7 and 8 above, and further in view of Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1). Claims 36 and 40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent

6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662), Kovak (U.S. Publication 2002/0095443 A1) and Dabney (U.S. Patent 6,643,663 B1) as applied to claims 35 and 39 above, and further in view of Reuning (U.S. Patent 6,381,592 B1). Claim 46 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Dasan (U.S. Patent 5,761,662) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) and Weeks (WO 98/470083). Claim 53 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel (U.S. Patent 6,584,480 B1) in view of Wical (U.S. Patent 6,460,034 B1) as applied to claim 51 above, and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent 5,181,162) and Weeks (WO 98/470083).

Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, "a news story filter program for extracting text information from the news print publication electronic data files while preserving some tags in the news print publication electronic files" (Emphasis added.) Wical does not preserve a series of identifiably-marked data fields in a document, but rather identifies index heads from material in documents that are then dynamically classified in the classification hierarchy. Wical in column 29 in the paragraph beginning on line 34 states:

If the documents 130 include material on "OS/2", then "OS/2" is stored as an index head. The index context entries are index phrases that are used within the context of an index head. For the OS/2 example above, if a document contained information on the marketing of the OS/2 operating system, then "marketing" is stored as an index context entry for the index head "OS/2." Note that marketing may also be stored as an index head.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Wical that the terms "OS/2" or "marketing" are identifiably-marked data fields in the original document.

Claim 51 states, *inter alia*:

extracting raw story text and classification information and at least one tag in the raw story text from the news print publication electronic data files,

converting the raw story text and classification information and the at least one tag in the raw story text from the news print publication electronic files into an editorial database format....

Wical does not teach or suggest extracting at least one tag in a raw story text from a news print publication.


Claim 1 has been amended mainly by incorporating certain aspects of claim 11, and claim 11 has been canceled. Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "a news story archive program for extracting text information from certain ones of the Web pages according to a predetermined selection criteria, converting the text information into an archive format, and storing the converted text information in an electronic news archive." There is no teaching or suggestion in any of the cited references taken individually or in concert of a program for archiving Web pages selected according to a predetermined criteria, the Web pages having been derived from news stories extracted from news print publication electronic files by other programs.

Conclusion

Should the Examiner feel that any unresolved issues remain in this case, the undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number listed below to arrange for an issue resolving conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/25/05


Robert D. Lott
Reg. No. 28,441

JAECKLE FLEISCHMANN & MUGEL, L.L.P.
190 Linden Oaks
Rochester, New York 14625-2812
Tel: (585) 899-2930
Fax: (585) 899-2931